## Case 5:06-cv-04135-JW Document 17 Filed 11/16/06 Page 1 of 3

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL THOMAS H. CARLSON (State Bar No. 121 AARON P. SILBERMAN (State Bar No. 16 311 California Street San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: 415.956.2828 Facsimile: 415.956.6457  Attorneys for Plaintiffs 21X CAPITAL LTD. and DAVID A. BREWER	1367) 1021)	
8 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
1	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
12 13 14	21X CAPITAL LTD.; DAVID A. BREWER,  Plaintiffs,  vs.	Case No. C06-04135 JW (HRL)  STIPULATED REQUEST FOR FURTHER ORDER STAYING ACTION	
15 16 17	ROBERT WERRA; JOHN WERRA; 20/20 TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and DOES 1-50, inclusive,  Defendants.		
8			
9	Plaintiffs 21X Capital Ltd. and David A. Brewer, and defendants Robert		
20	Werra, John Werra, and 20/20 Technologies (collectively, "the Parties"), by and through their		
21	attorneys of record, respectfully request that the Court approve the following stipulation		
22	staying this action.		
23	This is an alter ego action in which plaintiffs allege that defendants are the alter		
24	egos of RJW Acquisitions, L.C. ("RJW"). RJW has filed for bankruptcy in the United States		
25	Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Texas (Sherman Division) (case no. 06-40238)		
26	and is the subject of ongoing bankruptcy proceedings in that court. In light of those		
27	bankruptcy proceedings, the Parties had earlier stipulated to a stay of this action.		
28	Specifically, by stipulation and order entered		
		Page 1	

Stipulated Request for Further Order Staying Action – Case No. C06-04135 JW (HRL)

253407.2

Parties' request for a stay through November 1, 2006, vacated the dates set forth in the July 3, 2006 "order setting initial case management conference and ADR deadlines" (including but not limited to the dates for the initial disclosures and the initial case management conference) and took defendants' pending motion to dismiss or transfer venue off calendar (without waiver of defendants' right to re-set such motion following the lifting of the stay).

As is relevant to the instant stipulation and request for further stay, two motions are currently pending before the Bankruptcy Court in Texas. Specifically, on December 4, 2006 the Bankruptcy Court will hear a motion to dismiss the RJW bankruptcy case and, if that motion is denied, on January 25, 2007, the Bankruptcy Court will hear a motion with respect to an alleged violation of the bankruptcy stay (the trustee of RJW's estate contends that the estate owns the alter ego claims pursued by plaintiffs in this action).

In light of these pending motions, the Parties hereby stipulate that this action be stayed until February 1, 2007, subject to the right of any party to terminate the stay upon five (5) court days' written notice. Such written notice shall be provided both to the Court and to all counsel of record. Once the stay is lifted, defendants' pending motion to dismiss or transfer shall be re-set and the Parties shall attend a status conference on a date to be set by the Court to discuss the date for initial disclosures, ADR compliance and options, and other trial setting activities.

The Parties, as well as RJW's trustee in bankruptcy, all agree that it will promote judicial efficiency, and is in the interests of the Parties and RJW, if this action is stayed until the further activities in RJW's Bankruptcy case take place.

22 | //

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23 | //

24 | //

25 //

26 //

27 | //

8 || //

28

## Case 5:06-cv-04135-JW Document 17 Filed 11/16/06 Page 3 of 3

1	The Parties respectfully request that the court approve the forgoing stipulation	
2	and that the Court enter this stipulation as an order.	
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
4	For Plaintiffs:	
5	Dated: November 15, 2006	ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL
6		By: /s/ THOMAS CARLSON
7		Attorneys for Plaintiffs 21X CAPITAL LTD. and DAVID A. BREWER
8		
9	For Defendants:	
10	Dated: November 14, 2006	MURPHY, PEARSON, BRADLEY & FEENEY
11		By: /s/ JOHN FEENEY
12		Attorneys for Defendants ROBERT WERRA; JOHN WERRA; and 20/20 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
13		
14	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED	
15	Tenserii Te	
16	Dated: November <u>16</u> , 2006	By: James Bre
17	Buted. November, 2000	HOY. JAMES WARE U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
18		o.s. pprider cooki vobel
19		
20		
21		
$\begin{bmatrix} 22 \\ 22 \end{bmatrix}$		
23   24		
$\begin{bmatrix} 24 \\ 25 \end{bmatrix}$		
$\begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 26 \end{bmatrix}$		
$\frac{20}{27}$		
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$		